COUNCIL MEMBERS: PATRICK ROGAN, PRESIDENT TIMOTHY PERRY, VICE PRESIDENT WAYNE EVANS WILLIAM GAUGHAN KYLE DONAHUE LORI REED, CITY CLERK KATHY CARRERA, ASSISTANT CITY CLERK AMIL MINORA, ESQUIRE - SOLICITOR

	3
1	(Pledge of Allegiance recited and a
2	moment of reflection observed.)
3	
4	MR. ROGAN: Roll call, please.
5	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Perry.
6	MR. PERRY: Here.
7	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Donahue.
8	MR. DONAHUE: Here.
9	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Evans.
10	MR. EVANS: Here.
11	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan.
12	MR. GAUGHAN: Here.
13	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan.
14	MR. ROGAN: Here. Please dispense
15	with the reading of the minutes.
16	MS. REED: THIRD ORDER. 3-A. TAX
17	ASSESSOR'S RESULTS REPORT FOR HEARING DATE HELD
18	MARCH 13, 2019.
19	MR. ROGAN: Are there any comments?
20	If not, received and filed.
21	MS. REED: 3-B. TAX ASSESSOR'S
22	REPORT FOR HEARING DATE TO BE HELD APRIL 10,
23	2019.
24	MR. ROGAN: Are there any comments?
25	If not, received and filed.

1	MS. REED: 3-C. MINUTES OF THE
2	SCRANTON FIREFIGHTERS PENSION COMMISSION
3	MEETING HELD FEBRUARY 20, 2019.
4	MR. ROGAN: Are there any comments?
5	If not, receive and filed.
6	MS. REED: 3-D. MINUTES OF THE
7	SCRANTON POLICE PENSION COMMISSION MEETING HELD
8	FEBRUARY 20, 2019.
9	MR. ROGAN: Are there any comments?
10	If not, received and filed.
11	MS. REED: Excuse me, I omitted 3-D.
12	MINUTES OF THE NON-UNIFORM MUNICIPAL PENSION
13	BOARD MEETING HELD FEBRUARY 20, 2019.
14	MR. ROGAN: Any comments? Received
15	and filed.
16	MS. REED: 3-F. MINUTES OF THE
17	COMPOSITE PENSION BOARD MEETING HELD FEBRUARY
18	20, 2019.
19	MR. ROGAN: Are there any comments?
20	If not, received and filed.
21	MS. REED: 3-G. AGENDA FOR THE
22	NON-UNIFORM MUNICIPAL PENSION BOARD MEETING
23	HELD MARCH 20, 2019.
24	MR. ROGAN: Are there any comments?
25	Received and filed.

MS. REED: 3-H. AGENDA FOR THE CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING TO BE HELD MARCH
27, 2019.

MR. ROGAN: Are there any comments?

Received and filed. Do any Council members

have announcements at this time?

MR. DONAHUE: Yes, I have a couple,
Jog for Jude will be held Sunday, April 28th,
at 9 a.m., at the Dunmore Community Center.
The 5K run and one mile fun walk will benefit
S.I.D.S research being conducted at the Boston
Children's Hospital as well as the St. Joseph's
Center Baby Pantry. You could register for the
race at Jude Zayac Foundation dot com.

The St. Joe's Young Professionals will also be hosting a Jog for Jude happy hour this Friday from 6 to 8 at the Backyard Alehouse. A \$10 donation is suggested. And guests are encouraged to bring baby clothing and/or toiletries for the St. Joseph's Baby Pantry.

And also, the City of Scranton will be establishing a Complete Count Committee to bring together citizens and/or community leaders to increase awareness and motivate

residents to respond to the 2020 census.

If you or your organization would like to be a part of the Complete Count Committee, we will be holding an informational session along with representatives of the Census Bureau this Thursday, March 28th at 5:30 at Posh across from City Hall. And then I'll have more on the Complete Count Committee in Fifth Order. Thank you.

MR. GAUGHAN: I have one. I received an interesting call this afternoon from a resident. She wanted me to mention -- and I did not know this for those of you in the audience who might have Greek ancestry. Today is actually Greek Independence Day.

So I just wanted to mention that and hope that we're celebrating our Greek culture in the City of Scranton. I had a very interesting conversation with this woman who explained all of the different contributions from our Greek ancestors to the City of Scranton.

We do have a very strong Greek
culture in the city. I would also like to ask,
Mrs. Reed, if you could send a letter to the

Mayor asking if he would be interested next 1 2 year in raising the Greek flag. 3 This woman -- in front of City Hall for Greek Independence Day. This woman had 4 5 mentioned that years ago that was done every March 25th. So see if we can start that 6 tradition again. That's all I have. 7 8 you. 9 MR. ROGAN: Anyone else? MS. REED: FOURTH ORDER. CITIZENS' 10 PARTICIPATION. 11 12 13 (The following speakers offered 14 public comment as follows: Joan Hodowanitz spoke on City 15 16 Business. 17 Gerard Hetman spoke on matters of 18 general concern. 19 Lenny Srebro spoke on matters of 20 general concern. 21 Les Spindler spoke on matters of 22 general concern. 23 Sara Lancaster spoke on matters of 24 general concern. 25 Alfreda Martin{sic} spoke on matters

1 of general concern. Robert Bolus spoke on matters of 2 3 general concern. Ron Ellman spoke on matters of 4 5 general concern. Marie Schumacher spoke on City 6 Business. 7 8 Dave Dobrzyn spoke on matters of 9 general concern. MS. REED: FIFTH ORDER. 5-A. 10 MOTIONS. 11 12 MR. ROGAN: Mr. Perry, any motions 13 or comments? 14 MR. PERRY: Just a few comments. Lenny, I will get in touch with you as soon as 15 16 we hear something back, which I'm sure will be shortly and we'll get some kind of -- some 17 18 schedule set for you. 19 Something I wanted to bring up and 20 Miss Hodowanitz brought it up anyway. 21 this whole issue of City Hall and some of the 22 expenses came up, from time to time a city this 23 size that owns this many assets with 24 facilities, there's going to be repair 25 maintenance. That's just the way it is.

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But I think something that we can do more preemptively to prepare for these things and reduce cost is have a PM calendar or preventative maintenance calendar. I know we've discussed this in the past. But I think I would like to take a harder look at it.

In my mind, a preventative maintenance manager would have kind of like all encompassing accountability of our facilities. And I don't know if it would be a full-time position, if it would be extra on top of someone else's responsibilities or if it would be contracted out or third party; but I definitely think, you know, we're being pennywise and pound foolish with not having a good preventative maintenance schedule.

Because as you guys know, exterior issues lead to interior. As mortar goes, bricks start to move. They start to crack. that happens, more water gets in. Now we have interior issues. And anybody will tell you moisture is just nasty. Water's nasty to buildings.

And the longer it goes on, the worse it gets where, you know, if we had quarterly or

semiannual inspections of the buildings, we could notice something, set something up with just some adding some mortar, patching it up. You know, the stones would never be loose.

They would never crack.

You know, but unfortunately, you know, we don't have something that encompassing in place. We do have some things -- I know we have a lot of preventative maintenance schedules for our cars, our police, our fire. But as far as our facilities I think there is more that we can do here to prevent some of these shock and awe bills and assessments that we get.

We kind of seem like we put it on -and when I say we, you know, the City of
Scranton. I'm not talking about any
administrations. It's just it is what it is.
This is our building. And, you know, I believe
we need to take care of our assets and our
facilities.

And I think we can do a lot better at lowering the cost of it and the burden to all of us if we just kind of, you know, we took a better look at the overall ongoing

1 maintenance of it.

So if Council doesn't have an issue, I would like to send out our first feelers to Mr. Bulzoni and the Mayor. I would like to invite them into an upcoming caucus to discuss specifically a preventative maintenance calendar with the possibility of -- I don't want to say creating a new position, I'm just talking about creating accountability.

Where that accountability would be, the preventative maintenance of our assets of facilities. And, you know, I'm sure this could be a pretty lengthy ongoing discussion. But I think it's something that the five of us and, you know, of course, Mr. King, Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Pocius and the Administration would want to be in on.

I expect this to grow and become, you know, more of a positive issue going forward because, you know, for one, I don't want to lose City Hall. This is our history. This is part of who we are. And, you know, I understand that as of right now, you know, it's a huge bill.

We do have an application on this

for a grant which would help. But, you know, it's still tough to see. And I think we need to do everything possible to hold onto this building. This is our history. This is who we are. And that's, you know, call me nostalgic, call me whatever. But, you know, that's just how I feel at this point in time.

And I don't want to see it get to the point where it's too out of hand where we're unable to do anything with it. So maybe if we can get started and if we can, you know, get around this issue because I know we will. Where there's a will there's a way.

And one way or another, we're going to fix this issue and take care of it and move on. I just want to see this as you, you know, with emergency fixes with firehouses and all of our other assets, I want to see -- I don't want us to go to the point of a breaking point before something gets done.

I think there's better ways of
doing -- anybody who's worked in the industry
knows that anybody who owns any kind of assets
or facilities, they have an excellent
preventative maintenance process because it's

1 |

just the way to go.

It's how to take care of your business. It's how you take care of your assets. That's all I have for tonight. Thank you.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you. Mr. Donahue, any motions or comments?

MR. DONAHUE: Yes, just to add onto what Mr. Perry just said, Miss Reed, would you also be able to ask the Administration for a breakdown of the current building maintenance plan?

I also got correspondence back from Brian Fallon, the Director of Parks and Recreation regarding the price of the new showmobile. And that price was \$17,500. So, Mrs. Reed, would you also be able to send a letter to Mr. Fallon and the Mayor asking for copies for -- of the invoices for that work?

And also, I'd like to make a motion to put a resolution on the agenda for next week in support of our Complete Count Committee.

Data obtained by the census will help -- is used to help determine how approximately 675 billion in federal government funds are

distributed. 1 2 And just those little -- add up to 3 \$2,000 in federal funding will be lost for each 4 person not counted. So that's upwards of 20 5 grand for a federal funding lost over ten years for each person not counted. 6 7 MR. ROGAN: Motion's been made. Ιs 8 there a second? 9 MR. GAUGHAN: Second. 10 MR. ROGAN: On the question? 11 those in favor signify by saying aye. 12 MR. PERRY: Aye. 13 MR. DONAHUE: Aye. 14 MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. MR. EVANS: Aye. 15 16 MR. ROGAN: Aye. Opposed? The ayes 17 have it and so ordered. 18 MR. DONAHUE: That's all I have for 19 tonight. 20 MR. ROGAN: Thank you. Mr. Evans, 21 any motions or comments? 22 MR. EVANS: A few comments. First 23

of all, I would like to reenforce my position on the restoration of City Hall. So to be perfectly clear, we need to take responsibility

24

25

for this building but also be open to creative ideas if they make sense.

But always remembering that we are the stewards of this building. We are the caretakers of this building. And that's our responsibility. And we should take it very seriously. The current credit rating is BB plus. Generally credit ratings do not change unless there is an event that requires a review like incurring of additional debt.

However, I did participate in a conference call not long ago where several financial experts were on the call. And we basically tried to make an impact on them as far as our financial story and how it's improved.

So we hope that pays dividends when the time comes where the new credit rating unfold. Our goal, of course, should be at the very least a triple B minus rating which is the indication of investment grade rating, something we haven't seen in years. Something that would open the door for sound and strategic borrowing at favorable rates or further debt restructioning if it made sense

for the city.

But part of our case for a better rating is to formulate a debt policy as well as an investment policy as directed by the recovery plan. So I had conversations with BA Bulzoni this week. He's in the process of formulating those plans now. And we should expect something before Council in the very near future to create that answer to the recovery plan.

I also want to talk about some of my debates with PennDOT officials. First of all. there was the Kildare's Housing project. Council tabled legislation in the hopes of having a conversation on the impact of DOT rules imposed because of that project.

That road is considered a state road. The lack of response by PennDOT officials to even discuss this matter is troubling at best. The second issue is one that Councilman Donahue and myself have been working on.

Several months ago, we met with PennDOT officials, Chief Graziano, DPW Director Gallagher to discuss the intersection of

2

1

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Pittston Avenue and Orchard Street.

At the time, there were 38 documented traffic accidents at that intersection over the last three years. As of today, there are 39. So we asked PennDOT at the time for what we thought was a reasonable and simple request to place a 4-way stop sign system at that location and do a 90-day trial period and then reconvene to review the results of that trial.

PennDOT officials in attendance, of course, said they had to go back to their office to discuss requests with the decision-makers and get back to us.

Months have gone by and, of course, we had no response. Every day that passes is another opportunity for a tragedy to happen at that intersection. Several things became clear at that meeting. DOT officials were seemingly more concerned with traffic congestion than they were with the issue of vehicular or pedestrian safety.

While Pittston Avenue is a state road, Orchard Street is a city street. And as such, we should at least be equal partners in

what is decided at that location.

So with the risk of getting into the weeds a little bit, I'm going to talk about the difference between a road and a street as they relate to this discussion, something you may not have heard before.

But a road is basically a high speed connection between two places. It's about moving cars quickly. It's designed to minimize congestion, etc. That's the primary focus.

And it can be a detriment to bikes pedestrian, joggers, etc. This is the DOT motto though.

Streets on the other hand are more complicated. They have on-street parking, maybe bike traffic, turning traffic, different speeds, pedestrians. This is what you find in most neighborhoods. It's why people feel safer on streets than they do on roads because they are encouraged by design and other external factors to move cars to move slower.

So what Pittston Avenue is according to many urban planners is what should really be called a STROAD. A STROAD is a hybrid between a road and a street. So PennDOT tries in my viewpoint to move traffic quickly and

efficiently through a neighborhood street which is complicated because of the bikes and pedestrians and joggers, etc.

So a STROAD just doesn't work. It shouldn't be pigeonholed into the normal DOT design guidelines because it's neither a road or a street. So it should not be applying those one size fits all strict DOT rules on what is clearly a city street environment.

Earlier today I had a conversation with Chief Graziano. And he indicated to me that he had started the process of gathering information on the traffic and speed of vehicles near that intersection. And he should have that information back to us over the next several weeks.

So with that said, I'm going to ask Mrs. Reed if we can invite PennDOT officials to a work session or a public caucus to discuss their design rules, regulations, and how they impact our city streets.

I prefer a work session because I think we could meet with them face-to-face and have a dialogue and a conversation that hopefully will bring about broader idea of how

we can benefit each other. We will discuss the format as Council and we'll all decide how we want to do that.

But Chief Graziano, of course, and Denny Gallagher, the DPW Director should be invited as well. I would suggest sometime after April 15th. I want to give that study time to be finished and for us to have an opportunity to review it.

And finally, I don't want you to forget that every day is your chance to make this city a little better. And that's all I have tonight.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you. Mr. Gaughan, any motions or comments?

MR. GAUGHAN: Yes, a few. First,

I'd like to make a motion that we enter into

Third Order at our next Council meeting the

memo that we received March 23rd, 2019, dealing

with municipal building improvements from the

Business Administrator Dave Bulzoni.

MR. EVANS: Second.

MR. ROGAN: On the question?

MR. GAUGHAN: Yes, on the question.

I just want to talk for a minute about the $\ensuremath{\mathsf{memo}}$

that will be put into Third Order next week because it sheds a lot of light I think on the thought process that the Administration has on this building and how they might want to move forward.

So, first of all, Mr. Bulzoni -I'm not going to read through this whole thing.
I'm not going to read the whole thing into the
record because it's about four or five pages.
But I just want to touch on some of the
highlights because I think it's important.

Mr. Bulzoni states that while an alternate solution to renovating City Hall may be a bridge too far, we may not know unless we investigate it further. I would agree with Mr. Bulzoni in that statement.

One of the things that came to light as far as this memo is concerned, is that the Business Administrator was apprised of the sale of the former PenFed Credit Union Headquarters Building on Franklin Avenue. He says the building presently houses a credit union branch.

The corporate functions have been relocated to Washington, DC. The branch office

will eventually close. The building, therefore, is mostly vacant. He says, "I would fairly confidently state that the building is in turn-key condition for municipal use."

He gives a little bit of background on this whole situation. The city which we have on our agenda tonight applied for roughly 5 and a half million dollar RACP Grant with the state. The request was submitted based on an 8 million dollar authorization for municipal building improvements approved in 2017.

Since the grant is matching, the maximum the city could apply for would be 50 percent of the estimated project cost. Mr. Bulzoni states that he was advised that this round of RACP funding might be limited. He says, while I am hopeful that the city receives full funding, I would also like everyone to consider the prospects of full funding with the sense of realism.

Which I think is important because even though we're putting for the RACP Grant for nearly five and a half million dollars, that doesn't mean that we're going to get that. And as he states in his memo, he's been advised

that this round of funding might be limited.

He says while I'm hopeful that the city receives full funding, I would also like everyone to consider the prospects -- I already read that part. The remaining funds required to complete the project might be obtained through a debt issue.

Market factors for debt issuance are presently favorable for the city. The city might be able to use a RACP concept to keep debt service at a minimum until some existing debt matures. The city may also consider a three year construction note during the renovation period.

Construction notes typically require interest only during the period the note is outstanding. Principal would be due at maturity and would be repaid from a bond issue. This is one of the things that I talked about last week and where my questions come in and where I'm concerned.

And I think we should slow down just a bit and take a more deliberative approach as it relates to financing and the impact this is most definitely going to have on the budget no

matter which way the Administration decides to move. So I think we need to have a conversation about that.

Mr. Bulzoni also mentions the logistical issues abound during construction. And the gentleman from Highland Associates touched on this as well. He mentions that the building was last overhauled in 1979. During that time, the entire operation was moved to the Connell Building.

So I think we need to also take into account the cost of -- depending on how the city intends to do it, moving offices, moving employees, and what kind of additional cost that will take on.

He also mentions which I think is interesting that the city might have options following the Serrenti Building Project. He says that this public safety building project might not be completed substantially until the end of the year. I think we need to have an additional conversation about that and what he means by that statement.

He also says in his memo that he would not recommend a fragmented approach to

a possibility in the caucus this evening. In other words, if we're going to do this depending on how it impacts the budget, we may want to look at taking care of the first and second priorities, the things that are really pressing first. Mr. Bulzoni does not think that we should take a fragmented approach to that.

improvements, which is what I had mentioned as

He also mentions which I think is important a partial completion would require an annual capital budget allocation to address the issues in entirety, which would be in addition to the debt service requirements for the amounts borrowed.

The building even with full renovations has issues which will not be eliminated and, obviously, as everyone knows, parking will remain an issue.

Couple of the other things that he mentions in here that again, I think is very interesting is that the members of the Administration -- I don't know if it was Mr. Bulzoni and anyone else but toured the PenFed Building.

- '

He mentions it impresses one with how much turn-key potential the building has for municipal use, parking is substantial, refuse payments could be made at drive-up teller windows. The Licensing and Permits Department could have personnel located behind teller windows on the first floor along with many other conveniences we presently do not have in our operation.

That building is totally secure.

Upper floor access can only be made through secure access cards and mentions that he would estimate that operating cost might be substantially lower than those presently realized and forecast even upon improvement to the municipal building.

He states that it's his understanding that the PenFed Building presently lists for approximately 5 million dollars. And we would need to have an additional conversation about additional costs to the city to make that building fully operational.

But he feels that it should be relatively maintained -- or relatively

contained. The city would use the same debt structure without the need for construction financing. And then there is some other comments that he makes here.

But I appreciate the memo. I do think that we need to continue to have this conversation. I'm not really sold either way yet only because I think there is still a lot of outstanding questions.

I think financing being one of them. What is the -- going to be the impact of the budget. I think we need to see those numbers flushed out a lot more. Mr. Perry's suggestion about the preventative maintenance manager, I understand what he's saying. I disagree with it though just in the thought process that it's my understanding that the Licensing, Inspections and Permits Director is the maintainer of the building or should be in charge of maintaining the building.

So that should be one of his responsibilities. I don't know if we need to add another position in the budget. That may be double work. I do agree though that we need to have -- I think we need to have a public

caucus with the Mayor, with the Business

Administrator to discuss his memo which I think is important to discuss a building maintenance plan moving forward.

I understand that this isn't just the fault of this administration. It's the past administrations going back decades. And it's easy to complain about what has not been done in this building and the oversight on the part of many administrations.

But what we are tasked with as a Council now is what are we going to do moving forward; how are we going to maintain the building if we're staying here? And I would just like to know, you know, what direction the Mayor and the Business Administrator want to move in.

So we need a clearer picture on that. I do think though that we need to examine all options extremely carefully using a meaningful deliberative approach taking into account the immediacy of the building maintenance issues which we saw firsthand by the PowerPoint financing and most importantly impact on the budget moving forward.

The ayes

And then I think we need to vote on 1 the motion. 2 3 MR. ROGAN: Oh, we're still on the motion? Is there a second? Actually we're on 4 5 the question. All those in favor signify by 6 saying aye. 7 MR. PERRY: Aye. 8 MR. DONAHUE: Aye. 9 MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. 10 MR. EVANS: Aye. 11 MR. ROGAN: Aye. Opposed? 12 have it and so ordered. 13 MR. GAUGHAN: The second thing I 14 wanted to mention, I agree with Mr. Perry that we need to as I said invite the Mayor and the 15 16 Business Administrator and any other members 17 that might be helpful from the Administration 18 to a public caucus. But I think we should do 19 that by motion. So I would like to make a motion 20 21 that City Council ask the Mayor, the Business 22 Administrator and any other administration 23 official that may be helpful in discussing this 24 topic to a public caucus within the next few 25 weeks.

1 COUNCILPERSON: Second. 2 MR. ROGAN: All those in favor 3 signify by saying aye. 4 MR. PERRY: Aye. 5 MR. DONAHUE: Aye. MR. GAUGHAN: 6 Aye. MR. EVANS: 7 Aye. 8 MR. ROGAN: Aye. Opposed? The ayes 9 have it and so moved. 10 MR. GAUGHAN: The second thing, 11 Mrs. Reed, I'm going to ask just because I've 12 been approached -- I think it would be helpful 13 But I've been approached by a few 14 members of different neighborhoods throughout the city who would like to see and request a 15 16 park cleanup schedule. 17 So how does the city plan to address 18 each park, when they're going to go in since 19 the spring is here and summer is approaching, 20 how they are going to address the needs of each 21 park and what that schedule looks like, when 22 and in what order. So if we can ask the 23 Administration about that. 24 Also, if you could ask the DPW when 25 pothole patching will begin. Mrs. Schumacher

had brought up about the street sweeper. I'm also curious, I may have missed this, but can we also ask if the city received the grant for the second street sweeper that we were going for? I can't remember if we did or not.

And then if you can follow that up by when they're going to start that program.

Last week I inquired about the Mayor appointing two people to the Ethics Board. We did get a response back from the Mayor's Office.

Mrs. Reed, do you -- what did Mrs. Garvey say?

I can't remember now.

MS. REED: Inaudible.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay. So the Mayor -thank you. The Mayor is actively in the
process of submitting those names to Council.
And hopefully we can get the ball rolling on
that. Also, I received a letter from a
resident. I just want to read it really quick
into the record.

I'm writing to you to find out why
our neighborhood cannot get disgusting garbage
and clothes from the riverbank behind the Ice
Box cleaned up. I have spoken to DPW on behalf
of the neighborhood at least three times. The

response is they know about it, yet it remains there for months. This is disturbing to me when I have company at my house for repairs, visits. etc.

It stands out like the eyesore that it is. I'm asking you to see if you can do something for us. This causes blight and a rodent problem which we don't need. I would appreciate it if you could help us. So if we can forward this letter to the DPW, Mrs. Reed, please and also, I don't know, maybe the Lackawanna Heritage Valley Authority can coordinate with the DPW some kind of cleanup.

And we might want to copy Bernie

McGurl on that letter as well. Lastly, the

paving program for this summer -- I don't even

know if we're having one at this point. But if

we can check on that. And I've also been asked

by a resident to see if the Administration

would consider paving the 16 and 1700 blocks of

Wyoming Avenue. And that's all I have. Thank

you.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you. Just a couple comments. Most of our discussion tonight has been about the repair of this

building or alternative solutions. And again,

I would like to urge everyone to remain

open-minded.

Personally I feel judging by the numbers that we've seen so far, financially it's in the city's best interest to explore other options. That's not to say that's the route I fully support. If it costs more money to move, I wouldn't support it.

But one thing that our caucus tonight really brought into my realization is that this 10 million dollar plus project doesn't take care of everything. There is a number of items and big ticket items that are not replaced or repaired in this renovation.

One of the biggest is being windows.

And I understand the reasoning why because it would cost even millions more to do that. But when you're looking at doing all of these upgrades, you would hope some of the benefit would be energy efficiency, less utility bills.

We're not going to achieve a whole lot of that by leaving these old windows in place. Also, some of the other items that aren't taken care of in this review are the

bathrooms. The bathrooms are functional. But if you've gone in them, they're not -- especially the first floor bathroom is not the -- it's not a state-of-the-art facility by any means.

Security which is something that has been brought up, Scranton City Hall is probably the only government building in the city that doesn't have any type of security. Whether that is something that needs to be looked at in the future or not is something that, you know, certainly up for debate.

But that's not part of this plan as well. IT upgrades, which I know we spend a ton of money on trying to get our IT up to where it should be. It's nowhere near where it should be. And again, part of it at least within this building, you know, it's because of the age.

Water shutoffs, I know I did meet with Paul O'Hora who handles almost all the building maintenance. I know there's a lot of issues with the current plumbing within our building. To do a small repair in a bathroom, we have to shout down the whole plumbing system. That certainly shouldn't be the case.

And without these bathrooms being addressed, I wonder what will happen with that as well.

And finally, the last thing that really wasn't included at all -- and I hope it's not in the building but any type of environmental issues. Looking at those pictures, to me it looked certainly like it may be asbestos. There is also mold. There could possibly be led. Removing these type of items is not cheap.

That is not included in this 10 million dollar figure as well. I think the suggestion that Mr. Bulzoni made in his memo to explore the PenFed Building makes a lot of sense. I've never been in that building. But I do really like the idea of having parking for residents.

One of the biggest frustrations with this building for any resident coming here is there is only a couple spots, 15-minute spots in front of the building. There is no parking lot for the public. And you pay a meter. So a lot of times after driving around the block five, six times, they're frustrating before they even come in the building and then going

up a flight of stairs, waiting for an elevator.

A new facility can be much more citizen friendly for people coming in to pay a garbage bill, get a permit from Licensing and Inspections. And the building could be structured in a way where the first floor is all of those departments that the public is interacting with every day.

And then the upper levels would be the departments that don't have quite as much foot traffic. And on the parking note, one thing to keep in mind is -- and again, it's a beautiful building. It's a historic building. I'm certainly not saying tear it down or throw away the key.

But this building was built before people had cars. So you could see were there is deficiencies from an ease of use perspective. So I really think looking at other facilities outside of this building if the numbers make sense really is the direction that we should be going.

Like I said, a 10 million dollar price tag which in my opinion doesn't even cover -- maybe covers 75 percent of what needs

to be done versus purchasing a building that's listed for 5 million.

That means hopefully we would be able to get it for less than that, doing some renovations and having a new building with lower utility costs. It makes sense to explore. I do support the grant application. It doesn't hurt to ask.

But before voting for any actual funding, if the city were to do a match, it would be 5 million dollars. I'm sure there will be debt associated with that. Before voting on anything where we're actually spending money, I would want to see a side-by-side comparison based on the renovation of this building and a few other buildings that are possibly for sale in the city.

But I do think the presentation tonight was helpful. And I do agree if renovations are done, there needs to be a number of firms bidding, not just one.

And finally, I know myself and a number of my colleagues spoke with some residents on the way in. They were going to speak and then they talked to all of us. So we

did get a list of -- a lengthy list of issues with the property located at -- a four-unit property at 1208-1210 Philo Street. It's a four-unit apartment house. Residents state there's been 42 police calls in the last couple years, two or three abandoned cars towed, which I know that personally because I helped them get them towed, three pitbulls removed, numerous quality of life violations. Today a drug addict left and passed out on the neighbor's lawn next door.

And part of the issue is when the police go to this property or inspectors, the doors aren't answered. So they're having a hard time getting in. So if we can send correspondence -- and there is much more here. I don't want to read it all over the air.

But if we can send a copy of this

letter to the Police Chief, to the Licensing

and Inspection's Office to see what can be

done. It sounds to me like it may qualify as a

nuisance property. Because it's a rental

property, we have another route to see if it's

registered.

So I would like to check into that

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

as well. If the building is not registered that would trigger an inspection. Which from what it sounds like in this letter, if anyone walked into that building for an inspection, I don't think it would be passing.

So if we can pass this along to all those departments and ask for a reply, this has been going on for a long time. And this is one of the worst ones I heard in a while. That is all. Thank you.

5-B. FOR INTRODUCTION -MS. REED: AN ORDINANCE - AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 28, 2013, AN ORDINANCE AS AMENDED TRANSFERRING A TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION AGREEMENT OF CITY OWNED PROPERTY LOCATED IN THE 100 BLOCK OF HARRISON AVENUE TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ("PENNDOT") FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE REMOVAL OF THE HARRISON AVENUE BRIDGE AND INSTALLATION OF A NEWLY CONSTRUCTED HARRISON AVENUE BRIDGE FOR THE SUM OF SEVEN THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$7,000.00) TO EXTEND THE TEMPORARY EASEMENT FROM TWO (2) YEARS TO FIVE (5) YEARS WITH AN UPDATED OFFER OF JUST COMPENSATION OF TEN THOUSAND SIX-HUNDRED (\$10,600.00) DOLLARS.

MR. ROGAN: At this time I'll entertain a motion that item 5-B be introduced into its proper committee.

COUNCILPERSON: So moved.

MR. EVANS: Second.

MR. ROGAN: On the question?

MR. GAUGHAN: Yes, on the question,

I just asked for clarification on this piece of legislation from the Law Department and they did get back to Mrs. Reed. PennDOT needs additional time to finish this project.

Originally an easement was requested for two years for which they offered \$7,000 as compensation.

This legislation they're asking to extend the temporary easement from two to five years and updating the compensation value to \$10,600. Thank you.

MR. EVANS: On the question, yeah, since we're at looking extending this agreement, I would like to ask PennDOT if they can find out from their contractor when they will be cleaning up the debris that has accumulated up and down the Lackawanna River from the construction or demolition of the old

1 Harrison Avenue Bridge. 2 The debris from the bridge 3 construction found its way all the way down 4 along the banks of Lackawanna River almost to 5 the Taylor line. So anybody that walks up and down the Lackawanna Heritage Valley Trail would 6 see it. And my understanding is it came from 7 8 the construction site. 9 And quite frankly, I think it's a 10 disgrace. So I'll get with Mrs. Reed and draft a letter if that's okay with everyone and we'll 11 12 get that out next week. 13 MR. ROGAN: Anyone else on the 14 All those in favor of introduction auestion? signify by saying aye. 15 16 MR. PERRY: Aye. 17 MR. DONAHUE: Aye. 18 MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. MR. EVANS: Aye. 19 20 MR. ROGAN: Aye. Opposed? The ayes 21 have it and so moved. SIXTH ORDER. 6-A. no 22 MS. REED: business at this time. 23 24 SEVENTH ORDER, 7-A. F0R

CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE - FOR

25

25

ADOPTION - FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 59, 2019 -AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 17, 2018, AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 4, 2018 ENTITLED "AN ORDINANCE AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 17, 1994 ENTITLED "AN ORDINANCE (AS AMENDED) AUTHORIZING THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON TO ENACT 'A WASTE DISPOSAL AND COLLECTION FEE' FOR THE PURPOSE OF RAISING REVENUE TO COVER THE WASTE DISPOSAL AND COLLECTION COSTS INCURRED BY THE CITY OF SCRANTON FOR THE DISPOSAL OF REFUSE". BY IMPOSING A WASTE DISPOSAL AND COLLECTION FEE OF \$300.00 FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2019 AND THE SAME SHALL REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT ANNUALLY THEREAFTER" TO EXTEND THE MAY 1, 2019 DISCOUNT DATE TO MAY 31, 2019 TO ENABLE RESIDENTS TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE 10% DISCOUNT WHEN PAYING THEIR REFUSE BILL IN FULL.

MR. ROGAN: What is the recommendation of the Chairperson for the Committee of Finance?

MR. EVANS: As Chairperson for the Committee on Finance, I recommend final passage of item 7-A.

MR. PERRY: Second.

MR. ROGAN: On the question?

MR. GAUGHAN: Yes, on the question.

I just want to make it clear that -- Council is not voting on garbage fee or instituting the garbage fee. We've already done that back in I think December or January.

This legislation that we're voting on is extending the May 1st discount date to May 31st. So that's all we're voting on. We are not voting on instituting the \$300 fee.

That's already been voted on previously.

MR. EVANS: Yeah, this happened last year and again this year. The bills weren't all getting out -- are going out later than anticipated. So we all felt it was a good idea to continue with that --

MR. DONAHUE: We hadn't voted on the garbage fee yet. So this is a vote on the garbage fee.

MR. GAUGHAN: I don't think so. Is it, Amil?

ATTY. MINORA: I didn't hear you.

MR. GAUGHAN: Isn't this a vote -what we're voting on right now is to extend the
discount period. We're not voting to enact the

garbage fee. I thought we already did that 1 2 months ago. 3 ATTY. MINORA: We did that. MR. EVANS: That was part of the 4 5 enabling legislation back in December, I think, right? Or at least I thought it was anyway. 6 MR. GAUGHAN: 7 Yeah 8 MR. ROGAN: While we're on the 9 question, two points with all of these fees and 10 When the rate doesn't change, we do 11 vote on them every year although it's not 12 mandatory because each one of them does state 13 annually every year thereafter. 14 One thing I think we should look at because we have had to extend this discount 15 16 period because of delays in billing multiple 17 years is making that May 31st discount 18 permanent instead of having to go every year 19 and extend this. Anyone else? Roll call, 20 please? 21 MR. ROGAN: Roll call, please. 22 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Perry. 23 MR. PERRY: Yes.

MS. CARRERA:

MR. DONAHUE:

Mr. Donahue.

No.

24

25

	45
1	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Evans.
2	MR. EVANS: Yes.
3	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan.
4	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes.
5	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan.
6	MR. ROGAN: Yes. I hereby declare
7	Item 7-A legally and lawfully adopted.
8	MS. REED: 7-B. FOR CONSIDERATION
9	BY THE COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT - FOR
10	ADOPTION - RESOLUTION NO. 108, 2019 -
11	AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE
12	CITY OFFICIALS TO APPLY FOR AND
13	EXECUTE A GRANT APPLICATION FOR A REDEVELOPMENT
14	ASSISTANCE CAPITAL PROGRAM (RACP) THROUGH THE
15	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA'S OFFICE OF THE
16	BUDGET IN THE AMOUNT OF \$5,376,583.00;
17	ACCEPTING AND DISBURSING THE GRANT IF THE
18	APPLICATION IS SUCCESSFUL FOR THE RENOVATION OF
19	THE SCRANTON MUNICIPAL BUILDING.
20	MR. ROGAN: What is the
21	recommendation of the Chairperson for the
22	Committee on Community Development?
23	MR. DONAHUE: As Chairperson for the
24	Committee on Community Development, I recommend
25	final passage of Item 7-B.

	46
1	MR. PERRY: Second.
2	MR. ROGAN: On the question? Roll
3	call, please.
4	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Perry.
5	MR. PERRY: Yes.
6	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Donahue.
7	MR. DONAHUE: Yes.
8	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Evans.
9	MR. EVANS: Yes.
10	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan.
11	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes.
12	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan.
13	MR. ROGAN: Yes. I hereby declare
14	Item 7-B legally and lawfully adopted. If
15	there is no further business, I'll entertain a
16	motion to adjourn.
17	MR. PERRY: Motion to adjourn.
18	MR. ROGAN: This meeting is
19	adjourned.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me of the above-cause and that this copy is a correct transcript of the same to the best of my ability.

Maria McCool, RPR

Official Court Reporter

(The foregoing certificate of this transcript does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means unless under the direct control and/or supervision of

25 the certifying reporter.)